

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification has been amended to improve form and provide improved correlation with the drawings and claims. Claims 1, 8, and 12 have been amended, claim 4 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 1, 3, and 5-13 are pending and under consideration. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate limitations of claim 4, and claim 8 has been amended to incorporate limitations of claim 12. No new matter is presented in this Amendment.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

Claims 1 and 3-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lamkin et al. (U.S. Patent 7,178,106). Claim 4 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. The rejection of claim 4 is thus moot.

Lamkin does not disclose all the limitations of claim 1 as amended. For example, Lamkin fails to disclose wherein the markup document includes event registration information to check whether the user performed the action. The RCBUTTONEVENT function disclosed by Lamkin in Table A.3.20 does not check whether the user performed the action. According to Lamkin's disclosure, the RCBUTTONEVENT function is called when a button on the remote control has been pressed, and takes as input an integer corresponding to the button that was pressed. The system does not need to check whether the user performed the action because by the time the RCBUTTONEVENT function is called, the system already knows not only that the user pressed a button, but also which button the user pressed.

Lamkin also discloses launching a special markup document, VIDPLAY.HTM, when a play button is pressed and no video is being displayed (col. 18, lines 42-45). The VIDPLAY.HTM document is loaded in response to the button being pressed, that is, after the button is pressed. At the time the button is pressed, the VIDPLAY.HTM document has not been loaded yet; thus, the system cannot use information contained within the VIDPLAY.HTM document to handle the button press. Even if the system could somehow use the information within the document before the document has been loaded, Lamkin does not disclose the content of the VIDPLAY.HTM document. In particular, Lamkin is silent as to whether the VIDPLAY document contains first event information. Because Lamkin does not disclose first event information that

includes event registration information to check whether the user performed the action, Lamkin does not disclose all the limitations of claim 1, and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Lamkin also fails to disclose wherein, when a second event occurs using second event information recorded in the markup document, the ENAV engine refrains from informing the AV playback engine of the occurrence of the key input event. Lamkin discloses that during the interactive mode, certain functions are disabled (col. 19, lines 51-55). Lamkin does not disclose how the functions are disabled. In particular, Lamkin does not disclose that the system refers to second event information contained in the markup document when disabling the functions. The extensive API documentation disclosed by Lamkin does not include such a second event. Accordingly, Lamkin fails to disclose all the limitations of claim 1.

Claims 3 and 5-7 depend from claim 1. The rejection of claims 3-7 should be withdrawn for the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

Claims 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamkin et al. (U.S. Patent 7,178,106) in view of Kanazawa et al. (U.S. Patent 6,580,870).

Claim 8 as amended contains language similar to claim 1. Kanazawa fails to remedy the deficiencies in Lamkin identified above. For example, Kanazawa does not disclose or suggest that the first event information includes event registration information to check whether the user performed the action. Since the combination of Lamkin and Kanazawa does not disclose all the limitations of claim 8, the rejection of claim 8 should be withdrawn.

Claims 9-13 depend from claim 8. The rejection of claims 9-13 should be withdrawn for the reasons given above with respect to claim 8.

CONCLUSION:

Applicant(s) request(s) entry of this Rule 116 Response because the amendment of claims 1, 8, and 12 should not entail any further search by the Examiner since no new features are being added or no new issues are being raised relative to issues raised in at least related application no. 10/647,445. The amendment does not significantly alter the scope of the claims,

and places the application at least into a better form for purposes of appeal. No new features or new issues are being raised.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 12/10/07

By: Gregory L. Clinton
Gregory L. Clinton
Registration No. 59,134

1400 Eye St., N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510